REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the consideration given the present application.

Claim 31 is combined with claim 32, which is cancelled. Amended claim 31 addresses the issue noted on page 2 of the Office Action, thereby obviating the objection to the claim.

All independent claims now require the notification to include an electronic token. As a result, dependent claims 6 and 22, which previously recited this limitation, are cancelled. The claims are also amended for clarity.

Claims 1, 2, 11-16, 18, 19, 27-30, and 32 are not anticipated by Gunnarsson et al. (U.S. 2003-0118015).

As indicated in the Office Action, Gunnarsson does not disclose a notification having an electronic token. Therefore, the Office Action incorrectly relies on paragraphs 38, 55, and 57 of Jokinen et al. (U.S. 2002-009533) to cure this deficiency.

The relied-on portion of Jokinen merely discloses the issuance of electronic coupons in response to a mobile device getting into the vicinity of a particular location. However, Gunnarsson merely relates to a wireless mobile terminal being alerted to its presence in an available Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) by a communication network. Because there is nothing in Gunnarsson regarding a

notification including an electronic token or any type of promotional activity, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified Gunnarsson in view of Jokinen. The Office Action contends the motivation to combine these two references is to enable Gunnarsson to advertise discounted services or goods at a retail outlet. However, Gunnarsson is not at all interesting in advertising services or goods at a retail outlet. Instead, Gunnarsson deals with the minimizing power dissipation and maximizing battery life. See paragraph [0004].

Consequently, there is no reason to combine Gunnarsson and Jokinen to arrive at the combined features of the independent claims. The combination of references clearly results from casting about to find bits and pieces of Applicants' claims and combining them through the use of hindsight.

The Examiner must explain why one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified Gunnarsson in view of Jokinen to provide the requirement of claims 1 and 18 to transmit a notification including an electronic token to a mobile unit via a first telecommunication network when the mobile unit moves within the vicinity of an access node of a second network.

The Examiner must also explain the motivation for modifying Gunnarsson as a result of Jokinen to meet the claim 17 requirement of a telecommunication system having first and second networks in combination with means for accessing a data storage device having the

location of at least one access point of the second wireless telecommunication network stored thereon, and means for causing a notification to be transmitted to a mobile communication device when the mobile communication device first comes within a predetermined distance of an access point of the second wireless telecommunication network, wherein the notification comprises an electronic token redeemable at the location of the access point.

The Examiner must explain why one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified Gunnarsson as a result of Jokinen to arrive at the claim 31 method of notifying a mobile communication device user to the presence of a network access point, the method comprising transmitting a notification including an electronic token to a mobile communication device via a first telecommunication network when that mobile communication device first moves within a predetermined distance of a network access point, wherein the notification comprises a reward redeemable at a retail outlet located at the network point, a wireless communication system having one or more access nodes to the wireless communication system, the method further comprising providing details of the location of the one or more access node nodes to a further telecommunications network.

Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 11-16, 18, 19, 27-30, and 32 are not anticipated by Gunnarsson. Withdrawal of the rejection is in order.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 3-5, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunnarsson et al. in view of Juurikko (U.S. 2003-0003868).

Claims 3-5, 20, and 21 depend from and are allowable with independent claims 1 and 18. Juurikko does not remedy the deficiencies discussed above in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 18. Withdrawal of the rejection is in order.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 9 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gunnarsson and Jokinen in view of Kaminkow et al. (U.S. 2003-0036425).

Claims 9 and 25 depend on and are allowable with independent claims 1 and 18, respectively. Gunnarsson and Jokinen have been discussed at length. Kaminkow is not a proper reference against the present application, since the British application upon which the present application claims priority under 35 U.S.C. \$119 was filed July 31, 2002, and therefore predates, Kaminkow which has a U.S. filing date of August 6, 2002. Withdrawal of the rejection is in order.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are in order, and such action is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants hereby request any required extension of time not otherwise requested and hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge any prescribed fees not otherwise provided for, including application processing, extension, and extra claims fees, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

James McDONNELL et al.

By:

Allan M. Lowe Reg. No. 19,641

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P. O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400 703-684-1111 telephone 970-898-0640 telecopier ANL:rk